arXiv:quant-ph/0503014v1 1 Mar 2005

Comment on "Kepler problem in Dirac theory for a particle with position-dependent mass"

Antonio S. de Castro

UNESP - Campus de Guaratinguetá
Departamento de Física e Química
Caixa Postal 205
12516-410 Guaratinguetá SP - Brasil

E-mail address: castro@feg.unesp.br (A.S. de Castro)

In a recent paper, Vakarchuk [1] approached the Dirac equation coupled to a vector Coulomb potential for a particle with an effective mass dependent on the position. He assumed that the effective mass has a form of a multipole expansion and took only the first two lowest terms into account. In effect, he considered a fermion in the background of a mixed vector-scalar Coulomb potential.

Back in 1973 Soff [2] et al. found the analytic solution of the Dirac equation with an arbitrary mixing of vector and scalar potentials. The solution for the spin and angular variables was expressed in terms of spinor spherical harmonics, also called spherical spinors, resulting from the coupling among two-component spinors and spherical harmonic functions. The radial equations for the upper and lower components of the Dirac spinor were treated by the brute force power series expansion method. In a recent time the solution of this problem was used to speculate about the breaking of pseudospin symmetry in heavy nuclei [3]. It is also worthwhile to mention that a pedagogical approach to the Dirac equation coupled to a mixed vector-scalar Coulomb potential is already crystallized in a textbook [4].

It seems that Vakarchuk did not know about the solution of the Dirac equation with a mixed vector-scalar Coulomb potential and, as a matter of fact, he presented a more elegant method to find out the analytic solution. Although it may seem strange, the author tried to map the Dirac equation into an effective Schrödinger equation for all the components of the Dirac spinor. Nevertheless, I am afraid that something might be by far wrong.

In order to clarify my criticism, let me begin writing the Dirac equation with the effective mass and the Coulomb interaction as given in [1]:

$$\left(c\hat{\alpha}.\hat{\mathbf{p}} + m^{*}c^{2}\hat{\beta} + U\right)\psi = E\psi, \quad m^{*} = m\left(1 + a/r\right), \quad U = -e^{2}/r \tag{1}$$

where a and e are constants. With $\bar{\psi}$ defined as

$$\psi = \left(c\hat{\alpha}.\hat{\mathbf{p}} + m^{*}c^{2}\hat{\beta} + E - U\right)\bar{\psi} \tag{2}$$

the author of Ref. [1] obtains

$$\left[\frac{\hat{\mathbf{p}}^{2}}{2m} - \frac{e^{2}E/\left(mc^{2}\right) - mc^{2}a}{r} + \frac{\left(i\hbar/c\right)\sigma.\mathbf{n}\left(mc^{2}a\hat{\beta}'' + e^{2}\hat{\beta}'\right) + m^{2}c^{2}a^{2} - e^{4}/c^{2}}{2mr^{2}}\right]\bar{\psi}$$

$$= \frac{E^{2} - m^{2}c^{4}}{2mc^{2}}\bar{\psi} \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{r}/r$, σ stands for the Pauli matrices and the 4×4 matrices $\hat{\beta}'$ and $\hat{\beta}''$ are defined as

$$\hat{\beta}' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\beta}'' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{4}$$

Instead of σ, a 4×4 matrix whose block diagonal elements are Pauli matrices, σ, and whose off-diagonal block elements are zero, should used. Furthermore, contrary to the statement of author of Ref. [1], Eq. (3) does not have the form of a Schrödinger equation. This criticism is endorsed by observing that the "centrifugal barrier" term contains off-diagonal matrix elements which mix the upper and lower components of the quadrispinor $\bar{\psi}$.

By introducing the operator

$$\hat{\Lambda} = -\left(\sigma.\hat{\mathbf{L}}+\hbar\right) + \frac{i}{c}\sigma.\mathbf{n}\left(mc^2 a\hat{\beta}'' + e^2\hat{\beta}'\right) \tag{5}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{L}}$ is the angular momentum operator, Eq. (3) in the spherical coordinate system is supposed to reduce to [1]:

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{1}{r}\frac{d^2}{dr^2}r - \frac{e^2E/\left(mc^2\right) - mc^2 a}{r} + \frac{\hbar^2 l^*\left(l^*+1\right)}{2mr^2}\right]R = \frac{E^2 - m^2c^4}{2mc^2}R \tag{6}$$

where R is the radial part of $\bar{\psi}$, $\hbar^2 l^*\left(l^*+1\right)$ is the eigenvalue of the operator $\hat{\Lambda}\left(\hat{\Lambda}+\hbar\right)$ for some eigenfunction, of course, and

$$l^* = \sqrt{\left(j+\frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{mca}{\hbar}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{e^2}{\hbar c}\right)^2} - \frac{1}{2} \mp \frac{1}{2} \tag{7}$$

with the upper sign for $j = l + 1/2$ and the lower sign for $j = l - 1/2$. Note that $\hat{\Lambda}$ operates on the spin and angular variables. It is a generalization of the spin-orbit coupling operator $\hat{K}$, part of the toolkit for studying the Dirac equation with spherically symmetric potentials (see, e.g., [2]-[4]), and has the spinor spherical harmonic as eigenfunction. The eigenfunction of the operator $\hat{\Lambda}$ is not specified in Ref. [1]. In that case, what is the generalized spinor spherical harmonic?

The author of Ref. [1] affirms that Eq. (6) formally coincides with the nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation for the Kepler problem. This declaration would be faithful if l^* could only assume nonnegative integer values but it does not in general. Therefore, one can neither identify R with

the usual radial functions of the nonrelativistic hydrogen problem R_{nl}, with $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ and $l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, (n-1)$ nor identify $\left(E^2 - m^2c^4\right)/(2mc^2)$ with the "Bohr formula" for the energy levels. Notice, though, that the identification is believed to be true when $e^2 = mc^2|a|$, i.e., when the scalar potential, if it is either attractive or repulsive, is as strong as the vector potential.

If one insists that (6) is the nonrelativistic Schrödinger equation for the Kepler problem then the Dirac eigenenergy solution (Eq. (4.2) in Ref. [1]) should have two branches of solutions, corresponding to positive and negative energy in a general circumstance. Furthermore, the condition to the existence of bounded solutions should be written as $a < e^2E/\left(m^2c^4\right)$ and not $a < e^2/\left(mc^2\right)$.

Based on the above considerations it is not difficult to be vehemently opposed not only the solutions found in Ref. [1] but also the conclusions manifested there.

This work was supported in part by means of funds provided by CNPq and FAPESP.

References

[1] Vakarchuk I O 2005 arXiv: quant-ph/0502105

[2] Soff G et al. 1973 Z. Naturforsch **28a** 1389

[3] Ginocchio J N 1977 Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** 436

[4] Greiner W 1990 Relativistic Quantum Mechanics, Wave Equations (Springer-Verlag, Berlin).